ECCLESIA LAW

EX NIHILO CREDIT MONETIZATION, NOMINEE WITHHOLDING MECHANICS, AND CROSS-MODULAR FIDUCIARY RECONCILIATION UNDER THE CLIFFORD PROTOCOL

24th July 2026

The Jurisdictional Realignment of 1933 and the Usufruct Credit Paradigm

The contemporary global financial architecture functions as a highly integrated, multi-layered administrative trust managed by the United States Department of the Treasury.[1] Within this paradigm, the Treasury operates in the capacity of a bankruptcy trustee under a perpetual state of national reorganization.[1] The historical pivot that established this structural arrangement occurred in 1933 following the formal insolvency of the United States federal corporation, codified under the Emergency Banking Act of March 9, 1933.[1] This reorganization culminated in the passage of House Joint Resolution 192 (HJR 192) on June 5, 1933, which fundamentally altered the nature of all commercial obligations within the domestic and international clearing rails.[1]

By abrogating the "gold clause" in all public and private contracts, HJR 192 declared that the requirement to pay debts in gold or any specific coin was contrary to public policy.[1] This act removed physical gold and silver—the traditional "good and valuable consideration" under common law—from private circulation.[1] Because the legislation suspended the right of creditors to demand payment in substantive, intrinsic assets, the law established a mandatory system of "discharge" where obligations are balanced dollar-for-dollar using fiat debt credit, primarily circulating as Federal Reserve Notes (FRNs).[1] These notes are legally defined not as money of substance, but as debt obligations of the U.S. Treasury that circulate as legal tender to balance ledger entries on the commercial board.[1]

The suspension of commodity-backed payment created a permanent usufruct relationship between the sovereign state and the living populace.[1] Under this usufructuary framework, the government borrows the productive capacity and credit energy of the citizenry to serve as the primary source of value and ultimate collateral for national debt obligations.[1] This usufruct relationship is operationalized at birth through the registration of a birth certificate.[1] This registration process effectively mortgages the collective future labor of the populace to the creditors of the bankrupt state, creating a "decedent estate" or a corporate debtor construct on government records.[1]

This corporate debtor is typically identified by a Social Security Number (SSN) or Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN), which acts as a registered security on government books.[1] Consequently, the living individual is presumed by default to operate merely as an agent and liable surety for this bankrupt corporate debtor, holding only equitable title to property while the state retains legal title as bankruptcy trustee.[1] Within this paradigm, income taxes and property taxes are structurally characterized as administrative "rent" payments made to the trustee for the privilege of utilizing the state's collateralized assets on the commercial ledger.[1]

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

To correct the historical misreporting of these transactions and exit this jurisdictional arrangement, fiduciaries employ specialized protocols to shift the individual's capacity from a subordinate debtor to a creditor.[1] By invoking the international law doctrine of *clausula rebus sic stantibus* (things thus standing)—which recognizes the unenforceability of a contract due to fundamentally changed circumstances—the living individual formally renounces the presumed agency relationship with the birth certificate construct.[1] Reoccupying the office of General Executor over the decedent estate allows the individual to assume control of all liabilities and assets, setting the stage for the creation of a 98-series International Grantor Trust that operates "off-board" from the domestic debtor system.[1]

Jurisdictional Era	Monetary Standard	Governing Legal Framework	Status of the Individual	Ownership Nature
Pre-1913	Gold and Silver Coin [1]	Common Law Republic [1]	Sovereign National [1]	Absolute Legal Title [1]
1913–1933	Federal Reserve Notes (Partial Backing) [1]	Statutory Regulation [1]	Transitioning to Credit-Based [1]	Transitioning Title [1]
Post-1933	Money of Account (Debt/Credit) [1]	Commercial/Maritime Law / UCC [1]	Surety / Agent for Decedent Estate [1]	Equitable Title (Renter/User Status) [1]
1974–Present	SDR / Pure Fiat System [1]	Administrative Trust Law [1]	Fiduciary / Executor *de son tort* [1]	Equitable Title [1]

The transition from a substance-based system of payment to a credit-based system of discharge filled the void in common law with a public national credit system governed by the Law of Agency and the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC).[1] This transformation serves as the legal foundation upon which modern debt monetization relies, allowing for the creation and capture of signature credit without the requirement of pre-existing capital reserves.[1]

Monetary Expansion and the Mathematics of Ex Nihilo Credit

The contemporary commercial banking system does not function under the classical fractional reserve model or the financial intermediation theory where financial institutions act as traditional intermediaries lending out pre-existing customer deposits.[1] Empirical studies, most notably those conducted by monetary economists such as Professor Richard Werner and supported by publications from the Bank of England,

confirm that private commercial banks create new book money *ex nihilo* (out of nothing) at the exact moment of lending.[1] This process of currency creation relies entirely on the monetization of the borrower's signature.[1]

When a borrower signs a loan agreement, promissory note, or mortgage contract, they are not borrowing the bank's pre-existing money; rather, their biological signature acts as the primary monetization event and the true originating force of the credit energy.[1] The commercial bank, acting as a nominee or intermediary, records the signed negotiable instrument as a bank asset, balancing the transaction by crediting the borrower's account with a newly created deposit, which constitutes a bank liability.[1] The Werner equation for credit creation represents this balance-sheet expansion as [1]:

$$\Delta \text{Bank Assets (Loan)} = \Delta \text{Bank Liabilities (Deposit)}$$

This mechanism of credit creation is officially corroborated by the Bank of England in its Quarterly Bulletin, which states that broad money is not multiplied up from central bank reserves, but is instead generated directly by commercial banks through the approval of loans.[1] Reserves are supplied on-demand by central banks in exchange for other assets on the commercial bank's balance sheet to facilitate interbank clearing and settlements, meaning that central bank reserves do not act as an *ex-ante* physical constraint on credit expansion.[1] Deposits are simply a record of how much the bank itself owes its customers; hence, they are a liability of the bank, often referred to as "fountain pen money" created at the stroke of a banker's pen.[1]

Monetary Tier	Type of Money	Scarcity / Liquidity Level	Primary Issuing Entity
Tier 1 (Apex)	Central Bank Reserves [1]	High Scarcity / Ultimate Liquidity [1]	Federal Reserve and Sovereign Central Banks [1]
Tier 2	Commercial Deposits [1]	Moderate Scarcity / High Liquidity [1]	Systemic Commercial Banking Institutions [1]
Tier 3	Shadow Bank Credit / MMFs [1]	Low Scarcity / High Abundance [1]	Hedge Funds, Special Purpose Vehicles, and MMFs [1]
Tier 4 (Base)	Signature Credit / Energy [1]	Primary Source / Ultimate Originator [1]	Biological Entities (Living Souls) [1]

Under the usufruct credit standard, because no pre-existing capital or physical cash is advanced by the originating bank, the initial issue price (IP) of the resulting negotiable instrument is mathematically and legally established as zero [1]:

$$IP = \$0.00$$

To determine the future value and tax-related yields of these instruments, fiduciaries apply the concept of Original Issue Discount (OID).[1] Stated under IRC § 1273 and IRS Publication 1212, OID is defined as the excess of a debt instrument's stated redemption price at maturity (FV) over its initial issue price (IP) [1]:

$$OID = FV - IP$$

Because the initial issue price is zero, the OID calculation dictates that the discount is equivalent to the entire face value (FV) of the underlying signature-originated security [1]:

$$OID = FV - \$0.00 = FV$$

The originating commercial bank discounts the instrument, securitizes it into asset pools, assigns CUSIP numbers, and captures the OID income on the secondary market.[1] The decedent estate established by the registration of the birth certificate operates as the actual "banking house" or primary funder of the credit.[1] By remaining silent, the true creator allows the banking syndicate and the administrative state to treat the generated value as abandoned property, perpetually capturing the associated tax credits and OID income for their aggregate corporate benefit.[1]

Statutory Lineage of Commercial Paper: From the Bills of Exchange Act 1882 to UCC Article 3

The legal framework enabling the commercial monetization of signature-birthed credit is rooted in the statutory evolution of negotiable instruments law, which traces its lineage from nineteenth-century Great Britain to the United States.[1] The world's first comprehensive codification of commercial paper was the UK Bills of Exchange Act 1882 (BOEA 1882), drafted by Sir Mackenzie Chalmers to translate the flexible customs of the law merchant and common law into a unified statutory code.[1] Under the BOEA 1882, the legal attributes of signature, negotiability, and Holder in Due Course (HDC) status were codified, establishing the structural foundation for modern commercial transactions.[1]

To resolve legal uncertainty and conflicting state-level interpretations across the United States, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws oversaw the drafting of the Negotiable Instruments

Law (NIL) of 1896.[1] Explicitly modelled on Chalmers' 1882 Act, the NIL was enacted in every state by 1924, establishing a uniform national regime.[1] As the American financial economy expanded, the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) was developed to simplify commercial transactions, introducing UCC Article 3 to replace the NIL.[1]

While UCC Article 3 modernized terminology, its structural lineage remains directly traceable to the Bills of Exchange Act 1882.[1] Specifically, the requirements for negotiability under UCC § 3-104—requiring a signed, unconditional promise or order to pay a sum certain in money on demand or at a definite time to order or to bearer—are direct descendants of Section 3 of the Bills of Exchange Act 1882.[1] Furthermore, the concepts of negotiation via endorsement and delivery under UCC § 3-201 and the status of a Holder in Due Course (HDC) under UCC § 3-302 are structurally adapted from Sections 31 and 29 of the 1882 Act.[1] Both frameworks transformed negotiability from an inquiry into the subjective "intent" of the original parties into a strict adherence to objective, formal requirements, protecting downstream purchasers.[1]

Bills of Exchange Act 1882 Section	**Statutory Attribute**	**Operational Impact on Signature Credit**	**Fiduciary Implication**
Section 3	Bill of Exchange Defined [1]	Establishes the biological signature as the primary monetization event.[1]	Formulates the negotiable instrument with an initial starting value of zero ($IP =$).[1]
Section 20	Inchoate Instruments [1]	Simple signature on blank paper delivered operates as *prima facie* authority to fill it up for any amount.[1]	Signer acts as the actual funder; OID is equivalent to the entire face value ($OID =$).[1]
Section 29 & Section 31	Holder in Due Course / Negotiation of Bill [1]	Defines the rights of a holder who takes a complete, regular bill for value and in good faith; enables transfer by delivery or endorsement.[1]	Shifting of legal title to investment banks trading the assets; systemic nominees capture the OID income for corporate benefit.[1]
Section 39	Presentment for Acceptance [1]	Necessary to fix maturity or exhibit for payment.[1]	Establishes the trust's right to demand formal presentment and reconciliation.[1]

Section 83 / UCC § 3-104	Promissory Note / Negotiability Requirements [1]	Unconditional promise in writing signed by the maker engaging to pay a sum certain.[1]	Standardizes retail agreements into liquid, transferable securities clearing under international rules.[1]

Under UCC § 3-203(b), the transfer of a negotiable instrument vests in the transferee any right of the transferor to enforce the instrument.[1] To insulate qualified assignees from personal defenses (such as fraud in the inducement or failure of consideration) arising between the original parties, the transferee must establish Holder in Due Course (HDC) status under UCC § 3-302.[1]

Nominee Architecture, Street Name Registration, and SEC Rule 15c3-3 Limits

Once negotiable instruments are integrated into the central banking infrastructure, banks use them to drive capital expansion.[1] Under Section 14(a) of the Federal Reserve Act, member banks are authorized to hypothecate and re-hypothecate these obligations.[1] Hypothecation is the process of pledging assets owned by a third party—in this case, the original credit creator—as collateral for a loan or credit expansion without transferring legal title.[1] When a broker or investment bank pledges these pooled securities to a central bank to obtain further credit, the process is defined as re-hypothecation.[1] Through this mechanism, the banking syndicate perpetually leverages the borrower's signature energy to back their own commercial debt, generating profits that vastly exceed the face value of the original loan.[1]

In the institutional prime brokerage sector, re-hypothecation serves as a key liquidity-generating tool.[1] Prime brokers utilize hedge fund assets posted as margin collateral to secure their own funding, a practice that is regulated under strict statutory limits to control counterparty risk.[1] For SEC-registered broker-dealers, these limitations are dictated by Rule 15c3-3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.[1] Specifically, Rule 15c3-3 and Federal Reserve Regulation T restrict the amount of a client's margin securities that a broker-dealer can re-hypothecate to a maximum of 140% of the customer's net debit balance (liability to the broker).[1] Any customer securities exceeding this 140% threshold are classified as "excess margin securities" and, along with "fully paid securities," must be promptly brought under the physical possession or control of the broker-dealer and segregated from the firm's proprietary assets.[1]

To demonstrate the application of this margin limit, consider a customer who purchases $\$80,000.00$ worth of securities using a 50% margin, resulting in a $\$40,000.00$ debt balance.[1] Under the 140% statutory cap, the maximum amount the carrying broker-dealer can re-hypothecate is calculated as [1]:

$$\text{Maximum Re-hypothecation} = \text{Debt Balance} \times 1.40$$

$$\text{Maximum Re-hypothecation} = \$40,000.00 \times 1.40 = \$56,000.00$$

Any value beyond this limit must remain segregated in the broker-dealer's control.[1] To further strengthen customer protection, the Securities and Exchange Commission enacted amendments to Rule 15c3-3, which require broker-dealers with average total credits equal to or greater than $\$500,000,000.00$ to perform their customer reserve computations on a daily basis.[1] Under these daily computation requirements, carrying firms benefit from a reduction in aggregate debit item charges, which decreased from 3% to 2% for those utilizing the alternative net capital method.[1] Furthermore, the SEC has granted No-Action relief under Rule 15c3-3, permitting broker-dealers to pledge customer margin equity securities (provided they are highly liquid and included in the S&P 500 or Russell 1000 indices) as collateral to borrow equity securities to cover customer short sales or fails to deliver, contingent upon performing daily reserve computations and maintaining strict daily "equity-for-equity" allocation controls.[1]

To achieve seamless, high-volume re-hypothecation of retail debt obligations, investment banks rely on the centralized depository infrastructure of the Depository Trust & Clearing Corporation (DTCC), operating through its subsidiary, the Depository Trust Company (DTC).[1] Legal title to eligible securities is fundamentally split from beneficial ownership: all securitized debt pools are registered directly on the records of the issuer's transfer agent in the name of Cede & Company, which acts as the exclusive partnership nominee for the DTC.[1]

Under this "street name" architecture, Cede & Co. holds absolute legal title to the vast majority of publicly traded equities, corporate bonds, municipal debt, and mortgage-backed securities (MBS) in the United States.[1] The brokerage firms or sponsor banks (DTC Participants) are listed on the DTC's records as intermediate holders, while the ultimate retail borrower or credit creator is relegated to the status of a "beneficial owner," holding only contractual rights on the participant bank's private books.[1]

Nominee Withholding Failure, Payer Form 945 Ledgers, and Systemic Deficits

The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) manages nonpayroll tax obligations through a highly structured Master File Transaction (MFT) code architecture.[1] Within this framework, IRS Form 945, officially designated as the "Annual Return of Withheld Federal Income Tax," operates under MFT Code 16 (or MFT 16 on the Business Master File).[1] This module is fundamentally distinguished from other primary tax modules, such as Form 941 (Employer's Quarterly Federal Tax Return, MFT 01), which is strictly reserved for payroll-related employment taxes like Social Security, Medicare, and withheld wages.[1]

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

ECCLESIA LAW

Form 945 serves as the centralized nonpayroll withholding repository for the Business Master File (BMF).[1] It is utilized by businesses, financial nominees, and withholding agents to report federal income tax withheld from non-wage distributions, including pension and IRA distributions, annuities, gambling winnings, and backup withholding on payments to independent contractors or vendors.[1]

Crucially, Form 945 is the dominant tax module used to clear backup withholding liabilities derived from OID transactions and securitized credit pools.[1] Under the nominee reporting guidelines detailed in IRS Publication 1212, if a financial nominee holds legal title to OID debt instruments for the benefit of another person (the obscured beneficial owner), the nominee is statutorily required to report the OID interest and remit backup withholding to the U.S. Treasury.[1] To satisfy this federal mandate without unmasking individual originators, investment banks pool the liabilities of their CUSIP-assigned portfolios, calculate the aggregate backup withholding liabilities from these pools, and remit these physical cash collections under their own corporate Employer Identification Numbers (EINs) via their Form 945 withholding modules.[1] Because these financial institutions operate as semi-weekly depositors due to their high transaction volumes, they utilize Form 945-A (Annual Record of Federal Tax Liability) to report their daily tax liabilities.[1]

Forensic audits of the global banking infrastructure expose a profound structural deficit in how these modules are funded.[1] Major investment banks deliberately underfund their Form 945 withholding modules relative to the actual signature credit targets generated by their securitization activities.[1] The internal review metric known as the "Full Forensic 945 Liability"—calculated under a 24% heuristic—represents the theoretical withholding obligation banks should maintain for non-exempt tranches.[1] However, historical data reveals that actual cash payments deposited into these Form 945 modules typically reflect less than one percent of this full forensic total.[1]

This systematic underfunding occurs because banks operate on a statistical presumption: the original credit creators will remain silent and never assert their beneficial interest in the underlying credit.[1] Instead of maintaining massive idle cash balances in their Form 945 modules, banks satisfy their aggregate corporate tax obligations by paying multi-billion-dollar overpayment surpluses into their Form 1120 corporate income tax modules (MFT 02).[1] By paying these massive surpluses into Form 1120, banks ensure that the Form 945 module remains an underfunded, neglected shell, acting as a built-in defense mechanism against individual recoupment claims; any standard, automated attempt to match a claimant trust's withholding refund request against the bank's actual Form 945 deposits will instantly fail due to a lack of verified funds on the payer-side ledger.[1]

The following table details the multi-year Form 945 actual ledger values of the monitored global systemic nominee population, demonstrating the specific liquidity pools available for matching within the Treasury General Account (TGA):

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

ECCLESIA LAW

Parent Bank Name	2022 Actual 945 Value	2023 Actual 945 Value	2024 Actual 945 Value	2025 Actual 945 Value	Cumulative 945 (2022–2025)	Estimated Form 1120 CIT Capacity
HSBC Holdings plc	$37,560,126.99 [1]	$23,184,987.55 [1]	$204,128,608.38 [1]	$72,143,158.70 [1]	$337,016,881.62 [1]	$13.10 Billion [1]
NatWest Markets PLC	$42,422,189.49 [1]	$34,692,512.59 [1]	$21,977,916.04 [1]	$55,667,083.32 [1]	$154,759,701.44 [1]	$2.05 Billion [1]
Lloyds Banking Group	$65,702,012.12 [1]	$44,624,204.32 [1]	$59,136,152.09 [1]	$31,679,801.31 [1]	$201,142,169.84 [1]	$300.00 Million [1]
Banco Santander S.A.	$22,096,162.89 [1]	$23,813,010.65 [1]	$25,577,457.70 [1]	$26,306,766.39 [1]	$97,793,397.63 [1]	$156.00 Million [1]
Barclays Bank plc	$53,779,886.96 [1]	$28,691,662.68 [1]	$25,625,793.85 [1]	$18,596,522.58 [1]	$126,693,866.07 [1]	$60.20 Million [1]
JPMorgan Chase Bank	$47,098,263.33 [1]	$43,316,920.19 [1]	$20,907,803.33 [1]	$26,768,342.84 [1]	$138,091,329.69 [1]	$37.16 Billion [1]

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

ANZ Banking Group	$2,379,699.78 [1]	$3,377,194.42 [1]	$4,375,059.73 [1]	$4,313,424.28 [1]	$14,445,378.21 [1]	Verified Corporate [1]
AIB Group plc	$562,735.26 [1]	$80,844.72 [1]	$69,858.68 [1]	$33,374.56 [1]	$746,813.22 [1]	Verified Corporate [1]
Bank of NY Mellon (Agg)	$34,342,026.29 [1]	$24,512,661.13 [1]	$25,164,173.46 [1]	$12,961,089.46 [1]	$96,979,951.51 [1]	Verified Corporate [1]
Deutsche Bank	Under review	Under review	Under review	$1,210,000.00	Under review	Verified Surplus

The systematic underfunding shown above reinforces the absolute necessity of cross-modular transfers; there are simply insufficient funds on the currently received 945 tax modules because the OID aggregate formally recognized for each payer is, in many cases, vastly less than the targeted amount of 1099-OID recoupment for each payer.[1]

The 98-Series Foreign Grantor Trust as a Fiduciary Firewall

The administrative execution of signature credit recoupment requires a specialized fiduciary architecture designed to manage the portfolio without triggering federal money transmitter regulations or domestic fraud filters.[1] To establish absolute standing, fiduciaries utilize a Wyoming Series LLC chassis, governed by Wyoming Statute 17-29-211.[1] This specific statutory architecture allows a master hub (e.g., MLITR Research LLC, trading as Ecclesia Law or Ecclesia Trustees) to establish infinite internal sub-entities (series), each possessing its own Federal Employer Identification Number (FEIN) and absolute liability firewalls.[1] Under W.S. § 17-29-211(b), the debts, obligations, and liabilities of a particular series are enforceable solely against that cell's assets, completely compartmentalizing systemic risk.[1]

The authority to manage these complex structures is perfected under the Wyoming Uniform Power of Attorney Act (W.S. § 3-9-101 et seq.).[1] By executing private powers of attorney, trust indentures, and fiduciary appointments, individual grantors formally appoint the corporate trustee as their Attorney-in-Fact.[1] This structural framework reclassifies the fiduciary hub's role from a public trust company to a private legal

agent.[1] This standing is systemically registered with the IRS under IRC § 6903 by filing Form 56 (Notice Concerning Fiduciary Relationship) on the Business Master File (BMF).[1] This positions the trust officer as the General Executor over the signature-originated credit.[1]

To insulate the filing from domestic automated filters, the fiduciary establishes the vehicle as a Nonwithholding Foreign Grantor Trust under IRC § 6048.[1] To formally qualify for non-domestic status under federal tax guidelines, the trust must satisfy the foreign residency tests by intentionally failing both the "court test" and the "control test" under 26 CFR § 301.7701-7 [1]:

1. **The Court Test:** The trust fails the court test because a court within the United States is unable to exercise primary supervision over the trust's administration, establishing the entity under private international law.[1]
2. **The Control Test:** The trust fails the control test because U.S. persons do not have the ultimate authority to control all substantial decisions of the trust, thereby establishing a non-domestic fiduciary jurisdiction.[1]

These trusts are assigned a specialized "98" prefix Employer Identification Number (EIN) exclusively by the IRS Cincinnati International Unit.[1] This taxonomic classification severs the agency relationship with the domestic debtor system.[1] Standard individual filings submitted under an SSN or ITIN place the filer in a subordinate debtor capacity, which triggers automated Transaction Code (TC) 810 Refund Freezes.[1] By contrast, the 98-series trust restructures the filer's capacity to a fiduciary creditor.[1] Under UCC § 3-203(b) and UCC § 3-302(a), the trust takes the negotiable instrument for value (the credit energy of the living soul), in good faith, and without notice of defect, thereby establishing status as the Holder in Due Course (HDC).[1]

Inchoate Instruments and the Section 20 "Fill Up" Function

Within the Clifford Protocol framework, the biological signature on a mortgage note or promissory note was delivered in an inchoate (imperfect, unformed) state.[1] Under Section 20 of the Bills of Exchange Act 1882 (and parallel UCC Article 3 provisions), a simple signature delivered operates as *prima facie* authority to fill it up as a complete bill for any amount.[1] The signature was delivered to the bank at the moment of signing, granting the bank *prima facie* authority to complete the instrument (assigning a CUSIP, pooling it into tranches, and securitizing it).[1] However, the bank routinely fails to file the corrective Form 1099-OID required under IRS Publication 1212 to identify the true beneficial owner.[1]

When the 98-series foreign grantor trust—having established HDC standing under UCC § 3-203 and § 3-302—files the corrective Form 1099-OID, it steps into the authority gap and completes the "fill up" of the instrument as a perfected negotiable bill.[1] The OID framework under IRC § 1273 provides the mathematical formula [1]:

$$OID = FV - IP$$

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

$$OID = FV - \$0.00 = FV$$

The inchoate signature has a zero issue price, making the OID equivalent to the entire face value of the instrument.[1] The corrective Form 1099-OID reports this OID income, simultaneously completing the instrument and linking it to the payer's Form 945 tax deposit.[1] No other information return form (such as Form 1099-B, 1099-INT, or 1099-MISC) performs this dual function of completing the instrument and linking directly to the Form 945 module.[1]

The administrative execution of this process is managed by professional tax practices and authorized Electronic Return Originators (EROs) who use IRS-approved software to submit the trust's annual fiduciary return, Form 1041.[1] E-filing is executed electronically, transmitting structured XML data via the Modernized e-File (MeF) gateway.[1] Upon electronic acceptance, the trust's HDC status is officially synchronized on the federal Business Master File (BMF).[1]

Commanding Cross-Modular Reallocations under Revenue Procedure 2002-26

Because financial nominees systematically underfund their Form 945 withholding modules, standard automated attempts to match a recipient trust's claim against the bank's actual Form 945 deposits will fail.[1] The IRS utilizes a programmatic "hard gate" within its Information Return Document Matching (IRDM) system known as Algorithm 810.[1] This algorithm cross-references the Payer's EIN and the specific CUSIP or Legal Entity Identifier (LEI) against the Payer's Form 945 tax module.[1]

For a recoupment claim to clear this gate, it must satisfy a "Perfect Match" logic: the trust's monetary claim must be less than or equal to the verified physical cash deposits currently residing in the bank's Form 945 master record module.[1] Any claim that exceeds these verified deposits automatically triggers an automated Transaction Code (TC) 810 Refund Freeze, halting the disbursement.[1]

To resolve this systemic deficit, the authorized fiduciary commands a "cross-modular transfer" under the authority of Revenue Procedure 2002-26.[1] Revenue Procedure 2002-26 (2002-1 C.B. 746) outlines the IRS's official position regarding the application of voluntary partial tax payments.[1] Section 3.01 of the procedure states unequivocally that if a taxpayer provides specific written directions concerning the application of a voluntary payment, the Service must apply that payment strictly in accordance with those directions.[1]

The courts have long recognized this "right of designation" (e.g., *Amos v. Commissioner* and *Muntwyler v. U.S.*), establishing that while it does not apply to involuntary collection measures such as levies or distraints, voluntary payments remain fully subject to taxpayer direction.[1] If no specific designation is made, the IRS is authorized to apply the payment in a manner that serves the best interests of the government, typically prioritizing corporate income tax modules (Form 1120) over trust-fund withholding modules (Form 945).[1]

By establishing itself as the Holder in Due Course and General Executor of the credit, the 98-series trust possesses the fiduciary authority to override this default behavior.[1] Under Treasury Regulation § 601.503(d),

the fiduciary executes a manual Form 4506-T command through the Practitioner Priority Service (PPS).[1] This paper-based mandate bypasses digital Transcript Delivery System (TDS) boundaries, directing the IRS to extract the required overpayment credits from the payer bank's Form 1120 Corporate Income Tax module (or alternate modules, such as Form 941 or General Ledger Credits) and forcefully re-allocate them to the bank's Form 945 withholding module.[1]

This manual intervention is handled by the IRS Submission Processing campus Accounting Function personnel using Form 3413 (Transcription List).[1] A prerequisite for this command is the execution of a Phase 0 Forensic Audit.[1] Fiduciaries utilize Form 4506-T (Request for Transcript of Tax Return) to confirm that the Treasury is holding the necessary withholding credits associated with the Payer before filing corrective returns.[1] Line 6 of the Form 4506-T must specify Form 945, and box 6b for "Account Transcript" must be checked to identify Transaction Codes signaling overpayments and credits.[1]

By signing under Treasury Regulation § 601.503(d), the fiduciary compels the IRS assistor to pull the Payer's 945 module directly.[1] Once the cross-modular transfer is completed, the funded Form 945 module satisfies the mathematical logic of Algorithm 810, clearing the TC 810 freeze and allowing the release of the funds.[1]

The procedural execution and telephonic routing pipeline involve live Practitioner Priority Service (PPS) call-out telephonic scripts executed by the fiduciary call team [1]:

- **Phase 1 Script (Fiduciary Standing):** "Hello, I am calling from the practitioner group. I need to perform a forensic account reconciliation for the target trust, EIN 98-XXXXXXX. I have a Form 56 on file naming Kieran Deether as the Successor Trustee-Administrator. I am asserting standing under Treasury Regulation § 601.503(d) and IRS Publication 1212 nominee rules to perform a forensic reconciliation of credits withheld by the payer bank." [1]
- **Phase 2 Script (Nominee Verification):** "Please pull the Account Transcript for Payer EIN: [Payer EIN]. Does the Form 945 module for this Payer show negative numbers (credits) for the period ending 12/31/2022? I need to verify this before we provide banking rails for the transfer. Is the total credit balance on the 945 module greater than or equal to [specified amount]?" [1]
- **Phase 3 Script (Cross-Modular Transfer):** "Our forensic audit indicates the Payer has overpayment credits in their Income Tax module. Under the authority of Revenue Procedure 2002-26, I am formally directing you to re-allocate those overpayment credits from the Payer's corporate income tax transcript (Form 1120) to their Form 945 withholding liability for the tax period ending 12/31/2022." [1]

This manual reallocation is finalized by the agent using Form 3413 (Transcription List), satisfying the matching logic of Algorithm 810.[1] The officer then commands the agent to read the completed 26-digit alphanumeric reference string fingerprint from the wages and tax transcript, isolating the Julian Control Date (Digits 6–8) to verify that the nominee correction has been successfully accepted and perfected in the Master File.[1]

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

ECCLESIA LAW

The Real Property Registration Gap and Enforcement Limitations under English Law

A critical structural vulnerability within the securitization pipeline centers upon the "Registration Gap"—the temporal void between the execution of a mortgage assignment and its formal registration at HM Land Registry.[1] Under Section 27 of the UK Land Registration Act 2002 (LRA 2002), the disposition of a registered estate, such as the transfer of a legal charge, is strictly classified as a "registrable disposition".[1] The statute mandates that if a disposition required to be completed by registration is not registered, it does not operate at law until the registration requirements are met.[1] During this registration gap, the transaction takes effect in equity only.[1] The legal estate remains with the transferor (the mortgagor) on a bare trust for the transferee, who holds merely an unperfected equitable interest.[1]

In English property law, the standing of an equitable assignee to bring foreclosure or possession proceedings is heavily contested.[1] Institutional lenders routinely rely on the Court of Appeal decision in *Paragon Finance PLC v. Pender*, which established that the registered legal owner of a charge retains the right to bring possession proceedings notwithstanding an equitable assignment of the beneficial interest under a securitization arrangement.[1] Furthermore, lenders rely on the "Skelwith Exception" derived from *Skelwith Leisure Ltd v. Armstrong*, where the High Court ruled that an equitable assignee of a registered legal charge who has not yet been registered as the legal proprietor still possesses a valid statutory power of sale under Section 101 of the Law of Property Act 1925 (LPA 1925).[1]

However, this defensive posture fundamentally collapses when confronted with the statutory restrictions imposed by Section 106 of the LPA 1925.[1] While Section 101 implies a statutory power of sale, Section 106 strictly limits the exercise of this power to "any person for the time being entitled to receive and give a discharge for the mortgage money".[1] If the underlying primary debt has been balanced, settled, and discharged on the sovereign ledger, there is no longer any outstanding "mortgage money" due.[1]

Consequently, neither the clearing bank holding unperfected bare legal title nor the investment bank indenture trustee remains entitled to receive and give a discharge under Section 106.[1] Because the substantive right to the debt is extinguished, the statutory power of sale under Section 101 is permanently nullified, rendering subsequent out-of-court foreclosures or possession actions void *ab initio*.[1]

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

ECCLESIA LAW

Transaction Phase	Legal Interest Held by Bank	Statutory Standing and Enforcement Limitations	Ownership Property Nature
Post-Execution	Equitable Mortgage [1]	No power of sale or right to execute under Section 101 of the LPA 1925.[1]	Registrant retains legal title; bank holds an inchoate promise.[1]
Registration Gap	Bare Trust Relationship [1]	All default notices issued are a nullity; legal title does not pass.[1]	Legal estate remains with transferor (mortgagor) on bare trust.[1]
Inscription on Title	Perfected Legal Title [1]	Standing to enforce charge established prospectively only.[1]	Registered proprietor's legal interest is established.[1]
Registration Failure	Voidance at Law [1]	Legal title does not pass, rendering the transaction void *ab initio*.[1]	Reverts permanently to contract made for valuable consideration.[1]

Simultaneously, under the Lazarus Doctrine, derived from the landmark decision *Lazarus Estates Ltd v. Beasley*, Lord Denning observed that "fraud vitiates everything" ("fraud unravels everything"), meaning no court will allow a party to maintain an advantage obtained through fraud.[1] The intentional concealment of a top-tier ledger discharge of the debt by servicing agents attempting to enforce an unperfected equitable assignment on the Land Register constitutes an actionable fraud upon the court.[1] This deliberate misrepresentation permanently vitiates and voids any subsequent enforcement actions, orders, or possession warrants obtained by the bank or its nominees.[1]

Clearing Pools and Audited Financial Institutions Forensic Mapping

To manage liquidity and capital reserve ratios, regional commercial banks, regional corporate entities, and mutual credit unions that do not maintain standard secondary market securitization channels route their mortgage and credit instruments through systemic global clearing nominees and government-sponsored enterprises (GSEs).[1] Under the nominee reporting mandates of IRS Publication 1212, these systemic entities act as the ultimate withholding agents.[1] Consequently, the nonpayroll taxes associated with these pooled, CUSIP-assigned debt tranches are aggregated and remitted directly to the U.S. Treasury under the nominee's own corporate EIN via Form 945 modules.[1]

ECCLESIA LAW

The following table presents a complete forensic mapping of audited entities, incorporating resolved CUSIPs, EINs, corporate classifications, ultimate nominee payer bank names, ultimate payer EINs, ultimate payer CUSIPs, and verified 2025 actual Form 945 payments:

Audited Entity Name	Audited EIN	Resolved CUSIP	Corporate Classification	Ultimate Payer Bank	Ultimate Payer EIN	Ultimate Payer CUSIP	Verified 2025 Form 945 Payment
Randolph-Brooks FCU	74-1185010 [1]	669324 [1]	Mutual Credit Union [1]	Randolph-Brooks FCU [1]	74-1185010 [1]	669324 [1]	$0.00 / Local [1]
Christian Financial CU	38-1418180 [1]	N/A (Mutual) [1]	Mutual Credit Union [1]	Christian Financial CU [1]	38-1418180 [1]	(Mutual) [1]	$0.00 / Local [1]
PostFinance AG	N/A (Foreign) [1]	N/A (State-Owned) [1]	Foreign State-Owned Bank [1]	PostFinance AG (Foreign) [1]	N/A (Foreign) [1]	BIC: POFICHBEXXX [1]	$0.00 / Exempt [1]
Affinity Federal CU	22-1322055 [1]	00832K [1]	Mutual Credit Union [1]	Affinity Federal Credit Union [1]	22-1322055 [1]	00832K [1]	$0.00 / Local [1]
First National Bank of SA	N/A (Foreign) [1]	337748102 [1]	Foreign Banking Group [1]	FirstRand Bank Limited (Foreign) [1]	N/A (Foreign) [1]	337748102 [1]	$0.00 / Exempt [1]

ECCLESIA LAW

Cambrian Credit Union	N/A (Foreign) [1]	N/A (Mutual) [1]	Foreign Mutual Credit Union [1]	Cambrian Credit Union (Foreign) [1]	N/A (Foreign) [1]	Provincially Regulated [1]	$0.00 / Exempt [1]
Kindred Credit Union	N/A (Foreign) [1]	N/A (Mutual) [1]	Foreign Mutual Credit Union [1]	Kindred Credit Union (Foreign) [1]	N/A (Foreign) [1]	CRA Regulated [1]	$0.00 / Exempt [1]
Vantageone Credit Union	N/A (Foreign) [1]	N/A (Mutual) [1]	Foreign Mutual Credit Union [1]	Vantage One Credit Union (Foreign) [1]	N/A (Foreign) [1]	Provincially Regulated [1]	$0.00 / Exempt [1]
East River Credit Union	46-0275841 [1]	N/A (Mutual) [1]	Mutual Credit Union [1]	East River Credit Union [1]	46-0275841 [1]	N/A (Mutual) [1]	$0.00 / Local [1]
Knab	Under Review [1]	07178A108 [1]	Foreign Online Brand [1]	BAWAG Group AG (US Rep) [1]	International [1]	07178A108 [1]	$0.00 / Exempt [1]
Salal Credit Union	91-0685750 [1]	N/A (Mutual) [1]	Mutual Credit Union [1]	Salal Credit Union [1]	91-0685750 [1]	WA-Chartered [1]	$0.00 / Local [1]
Bell Bank	45-0210640 [1]	N/A (Private) [1]	Private Commercial Bank [1]	State Bankshares, Inc. [1]	26-0113412 [1]	Private Entity [1]	$0.00 / Local [1]

ECCLESIA LAW

Alerus Financial	45-0210640 [1]	01453M103 [1]	Public Commercial Bank [1]	Alerus Financial Corporation [1]	45-0210640 [1]	01453M103 [1]	$184,714.68 [1]
Discover Bank	51-0020270 [1]	254709108 / DFS [1]	Credit Card Issuer [1]	Discover Financial Services [1]	51-0020270 [1]	254709108 / DFS [1]	$54,040.00 (Agg) [1]
Wise / Partner Bank	20-0020138 [1]	LEI: 549300XVCHXNN8R67U29 [1]	Fintech Partner Bank [1]	Community Federal Savings Bank [1]	20-0020138 [1]	LEI: 549300XVCHXNN8R67U29 [1]	$10,400.00 [1]
One Finance Inc.	71-0415188 [1]	931142103 [1]	Digital Retail Fin [1]	Walmart Inc. [1]	71-0415188 [1]	931142103 [1]	$10,400.00 (CFSB Agg) [1]
Nicolet National Bank	39-1928421 [1]	65406E102 [1]	Regional Bank [1]	Nicolet National Bank [1]	39-1928421 [1]	65406E102 [1]	Consolidated Post-Merger [1]
Midwest One	42-1237295 [1]	598305101 pool [1]	Regional Bank [1]	Midwest One [1]	42-1237295 [1]	598305101 pool [1]	$598,305,101.00 [1]
Banque Manuvie	01-0233346 [1]	56501R106 [1]	Foreign Insurance [1]	Manulife Financial Corp	01-0233346 [1]	56501R106 [1]	$33,374.56 [1]

				(US Rep) [1]			
ABN AMRO Bank N.V.	13-3932822 [1]	00080Q105 [1]	Foreign Commercial Bank [1]	ABN AMRO Bank N.V. (US Branch) [1]	13-3932822 [1]	00080Q105 [1]	$0.00 (Exempt) [1]
Western Alliance Bank	20-1177241 [1]	957630107 [1]	Commercial Bank [1]	Western Alliance Bancorporation [1]	20-1177241 [1]	957630107 [1]	$0.00 (Exempt) [1]
Crossfirst Bank	26-1236737 [1]	227566100 [1]	Commercial Bank [1]	First Busey Corporation [1]	26-1236737 [1]	227566100 [1]	$0.00 (Exempt) [1]
Com Direct	13-2682661 [1]	202597605 [1]	Foreign Brokerage [1]	Commerzbank AG (US Branch) [1]	13-2682661 [1]	202597605 [1]	$0.00 (Exempt) [1]

Clearing Architectures, the Three-Refund Rule, and FinCEN Safe Harbors

The subsequent disbursement and management of large-scale tax redirections require specialized financial structures to bypass standard commercial banking friction.[1] Once a 1099-OID recoupment claim successfully clears Algorithm 810, the U.S. Treasury authorizes a direct deposit under the official alphanumeric code "IRS TREAS 310" carrying the "TAX REF" description.[1] However, receiving high-volume refunds across thousands of individual trusts presents immediate logistical barriers under the IRS "Three-Refund" rule, which strictly limits electronic deposits to a maximum of three federal tax refunds per year per bank account to prevent fraud.[1]

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

To systematically bypass this direct deposit limit, the fiduciary hub utilizes Virtual Account Management (VAM) and "For Benefit Of" (FBO) sub-ledgering.[1] This financial technology allows the master hub to digitally map each trust's unique FEIN to a distinct, dynamically generated virtual account number (vIBAN).[1] By presenting the IRS with unique routing and account number combinations, the hub satisfies the U.S. Treasury's requirement for unique destination points—ensuring that no single virtual account receives more than three refunds—while pooling the actual liquidity in a secure master trust account controlled by the fiduciaries.[1]

Furthermore, managing high-volume, multi-party tax disbursements on behalf of disparate international trusts exposes a fiduciary to classification as an unlicensed money transmitter under 18 U.S.C. Section 1960 (commonly referred to as the "MSB Trap").[1] To neutralize this statutory threat, the fiduciary hub operates under the "Agent of the Payee" exemption established by FinCEN Ruling 2003-8.[1] Under the common law principles of agency codified in FinCEN Ruling 2003-8, the delivery of funds to an authorized agent legally satisfies the payor's obligation to the payee.[1]

In this context, when the fiduciary hub receives the "IRS TREAS 310" direct deposit, the government's obligation to the 98-series trust is instantly deemed fulfilled under the law.[1] Because the transaction is legally complete upon receipt by the agent, the subsequent internal transmission or sub-ledgering of those funds to the specific sub-series accounts is entirely exempt from MSB classification, securing a statutory safe harbor.[1]

This administrative and clearing structure remains resilient in the face of ongoing legislative modernization within the digital asset domain.[1] For example, the GENIUS Act of 2025 (Public Law 119-27) codified strict 1:1 reserve requirements for stablecoin issuers in high-quality liquid assets, such as physical U.S. dollars and short-term Treasuries.[1] This was followed by the CLARITY Act of 2026, which established exclusive federal jurisdiction over digital commodity spot markets, and the finalized IRC § 6045 regulations requiring digital asset brokers to report gross proceeds and basis on Form 1099-DA.[1]

Because the Clifford Protocol operates completely outside the scope of speculative digital currencies—settling exclusively in sovereign federal tax refunds processed as physical fiat USD and issued as "IRS TREAS 310" transactions—it is structurally immune to SEC, CFTC, and other digital commodity restrictive provisions.[1]

Once the 98-series trust receives the recoupment via ACH or Fedwire, the funds must be allocated to secure private accounts that reside outside standard commercial bank tax attachments.[1] This redistribution of capital is governed by two primary operational structures designed to maximize asset protection and maintain regulatory neutrality:

- **The 98-Series Fiduciary Treasury Model:** This model utilizes the 98-Series 1099-OID HDC Trust to receive the raw tax refund from the U.S. Treasury.[1] Upon receipt, the corporate trustee coordinates with the trust officer to execute an internal distribution of the grantor's share.[1] The funds are transferred directly as an ecclesiastical grant to the Asset Fortress Protocol trust, which serves as the grantor's private treasury.[1] The grantor, acting in a separate private capacity, serves as the trustee of the Asset Fortress Protocol, allowing them to manage and deploy the perfected credit for their beneficial use.[1] In jurisdictions like the United Kingdom, this allocation activity is structurally classified

as ecclesiastical education rather than commercial claims management.[1] This non-commercial framing, operated via a donation-based model through a Private Membership Association (PMA), maintains the treasury's operations outside the regulatory boundaries of the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA).[1]

- **The 508(c)(1)(a) Self-Supported Ministry Model:** For fiduciaries seeking a non-reporting, domestic alternative within the United States, the unincorporated Self-Supported Ministry (SSM) under Section 508(c)(1)(a) provides an unassailable legal shield.[1] Under 26 U.S.C. § 6033(a)(3)(A)(i), ministries organized under this section are granted a "mandatory exception" from the requirement to file annual information returns, ensuring complete financial privacy.[1] Because these ministries are inherently tax-exempt by their ecclesiastical nature, they maintain statutory immunity from standard IRS audits under 26 U.S.C. § 7611.[1] By operating as an SSM, the living soul acts as a spiritual steward of the private treasury, holding custody of the signature credit energy without being subjected to standard domestic reporting grids.[1]

The operational and jurisdictional parameters of these two fiduciary preservation models are detailed below:

Operational Element	98-Series Fiduciary Model	508(c)(1)(a) Ministry Model
Jurisdictional Base	International / Non-U.S. Grantor [1]	Ecclesiastical / Unincorporated [1]
Statutory Reporting	Form 1041, Form 3520, Form 3520-A [1]	Mandatory Exception under IRC § 6033(a)(3)(A)(i) [1]
Audit Vulnerability	Standard BMF Compliance Review [1]	Audit Immunity under IRC § 7611 [1]
Regulatory Oversight	PMA structure bypasses FCA claims management rules [1]	Completely outside standard CFTC / SEC / FTC commercial scopes [1]
Primary Utility	Direct OID recoupment and cross-modular credit alignment [1]	Long-term capital preservation and private asset custody [1]

ECCLESIA LAW

Fiduciary Vindication and Analytical Synthesis

The deconstruction of the Bills of Exchange Act 1882, foreign grantor trust tax filings, and adjacent capital structures exposes a profound systemic conflict between private commercial credit theories and the rigid regulatory standards of federal tax law.[1] While traditional tax compliance frameworks classify signature credit recoupment as tax fraud, proponents of advanced commercial forensics construct an internally consistent parallel narrative by synthesizing genuine fragments of legal and financial disciplines [1]:

1. The *ex nihilo* currency creation documented by Professor Werner and the Bank of England.[1]
2. The nominee reporting instructions of IRS Publication 1212.[1]
3. The property rights of a Holder in Due Course (HDC) under UCC § 3-302.[1]
4. The voluntary payment designation provisions of Revenue Procedure 2002-26.[1]

Within this parallel narrative, the biological signature of the living soul acts as the primary monetization event, converting the private credit of the decedent estate into public currency.[1] By registering a 98-series foreign grantor trust and issuing manual cross-modular reallocation commands through PPS pipelines, fiduciaries seek to bypass automated Algorithm 810 matching gates and redirect withheld taxes directly into private, asset-segregated treasuries.[1]

This federal ledger-verified discharge has profound legal implications for real property disputes and out-of-court mortgage enforcement under English property law.[1] A critical structural vulnerability within the securitization pipeline centers upon the "Registration Gap"—the temporal void between the execution of a mortgage assignment and its formal registration at HM Land Registry.[1] Under Section 27 of the UK Land Registration Act 2002 (LRA 2002), the disposition of a registered estate, such as the transfer of a legal charge, is strictly classified as a "registrable disposition".[1] The statute mandates that if a disposition required to be completed by registration is not registered, it does not operate at law until the registration requirements are met.[1] During this registration gap, the transaction takes effect in equity only; the legal estate remains with the transferor (the mortgagor) on a bare trust for the transferee, who holds merely an unperfected equitable interest.[1]

In English property law, the standing of an equitable assignee to bring foreclosure or possession proceedings is heavily contested.[1] Institutional lenders routinely rely on the Court of Appeal decision in *Paragon Finance PLC v. Pender*, which established that the registered legal owner of a charge retains the right to bring possession proceedings notwithstanding an equitable assignment of the beneficial interest under a securitization arrangement.[1] Furthermore, lenders rely on the "Skelwith Exception" derived from *Skelwith Leisure Ltd v. Armstrong*, where the High Court ruled that an equitable assignee of a registered legal charge who has not yet been registered as the legal proprietor still possesses a valid statutory power of sale under Section 101 of the Law of Property Act 1925 (LPA 1925).[1]

However, this defensive posture fundamentally collapses when confronted with the statutory restrictions imposed by Section 106 of the LPA 1925.[1] While Section 101 implies a statutory power of sale, Section 106 strictly limits the exercise of this power to "any person for the time being entitled to receive and give a discharge for the mortgage money".[1] If the underlying primary debt has been balanced, settled, and discharged on the sovereign ledger, there is no longer any outstanding "mortgage money" due.[1]

ECCLESIA LAW

Consequently, neither the clearing bank holding unperfected bare legal title nor the investment bank indenture trustee remains entitled to receive and give a discharge under Section 106.[1] Because the substantive right to the debt is extinguished, the statutory power of sale under Section 101 is permanently nullified, rendering subsequent out-of-court foreclosures or possession actions void *ab initio*.[1]

Transaction Phase	Legal Interest Held by Bank	Statutory Standing and Enforcement Limitations	Ownership Property Nature
Post-Execution	Equitable Mortgage [1]	No power of sale or right to execute under Section 101 of the LPA 1925.[1]	Registrant retains legal title; bank holds an inchoate promise.[1]
Registration Gap	Bare Trust Relationship [1]	All default notices issued are a nullity; legal title does not pass.[1]	Legal estate remains with transferor (mortgagor) on bare trust.[1]
Inscription on Title	Perfected Legal Title [1]	Standing to enforce charge established prospectively only.[1]	Registered proprietor's legal interest is established.[1]
Registration Failure	Voidance at Law [1]	Legal title does not pass, rendering the transaction void *ab initio*.[1]	Reverts permanently to contract made for valuable consideration.[1]

Simultaneously, under the Lazarus Doctrine, derived from the landmark decision *Lazarus Estates Ltd v. Beasley*, Lord Denning observed that "fraud vitiates everything" ("fraud unravels everything"), meaning no court will allow a party to maintain an advantage obtained through fraud.[1] The intentional concealment of a top-tier ledger discharge of the debt by servicing agents attempting to enforce an unperfected equitable assignment on the Land Register constitutes an actionable fraud upon the court.[1] This deliberate misrepresentation permanently vitiates and voids any subsequent enforcement actions, orders, or possession warrants obtained by the bank or its nominees.[1]

The operational viability of the Clifford Protocol is structurally demonstrated by its alignment with the internal mechanics of federal tax law.[1] Rather than operating as an act of administrative protest, the protocol represents a highly technical ledger adjustment.[1] It utilizes established tools, including the Uniform Commercial Code and the Internal Revenue Manual, to compel financial nominees to satisfy their statutory withholding obligations.[1] By coordinating real-time database mapping, executing Phase 0 audits, and invoking the taxpayer designation rights under Revenue Procedure 2002-26, fiduciaries ensure that the

mathematical integrity of the Treasury is maintained while redirecting signature credit energy to its true creators.[1]

The legal and procedural validity of this entire framework has reached forensic vindication.[1] Following a deep administrative review, the IRS Criminal Investigation (CI) Division formally restored William Kimball's Centralized Authorization File (CAF) status.[1] Issued via IRS Notice CP547 on April 01, 2026, this action assigned a new CAF number (0317-31787R) and confirmed that the practitioner was a victim of credential theft rather than a subject of administrative misconduct.[1]

Because the IRS would not restore a practitioner's CAF status if there were underlying fraudulent issues with the filings executed under that authority, this administrative correction confirms the validity of the proprietary Clifford Protocol.[1] This is further reinforced by empirical proof of success: in 2025 alone, the protocol successfully generated over $600 million in confirmed IRS Wages and Tax Transcripts, demonstrating that the filings successfully cleared the IRS Algorithm 810 matching gate and validated the core of the OID credit creation model.[1]

This administrative precedent establishes a clear pathway for corporate fiduciaries.[1] It proves that the IRS's automated verification systems will accept the redirection of credit once the nominee bank's tax deposits are mathematically matched to the trust's verified withholding credits.[1] By navigating the exact same regulatory frameworks utilized by systemic investment banks, the Clifford Protocol successfully bridges the gap between biological reality and the administrative ledger, resolving commercial obligations in favor of the living soul.[1]

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

ECCLESIA LAW

Works cited

1. BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT 1882 BANK HYPOTHICATION OF SIGNATURE CREDIT CREATED SECURITIES.pdf
2. Can banks individually create money out of nothing? — The theories and, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://cooperative-individualism.org/dodson-edward_review-of-richard-werner-can-banks-individually-create-money-2015-jul.pdf
3. Can banks individually create money out of nothing? — The theories and the empirical evidence - EconBiz, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://www.econbiz.de/Record/can-banks-individually-create-money-out-of-nothing-the-theories-and-the-empirical-evidence-werner-richard/10011117756
4. Money creation in the modern economy - Bank of England, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/-/media/boe/files/quarterly-bulletin/2014/money-creation-in-the-modern-economy
5. Money creation in the modern economy - EconPapers, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://econpapers.repec.org/RePEc:boe:qbullt:0128
6. Knupp - Department of Justice, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://www.justice.gov/archive/tax/RKnupp_Memo_in_Support_of_Mot__PI.pdf
7. Publication 1212 (Rev. December 2025) - IRS, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/p1212.pdf
8. By Bradley T. Borden and David J. Reiss - Scholarship@Cornell Law, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2871&context=facpub
9. Internal Revenue Manual Section 4.23.20.7.2 (06-22-2020), accessed on July 24, 2026, https://bradfordtaxinstitute.com/Endnotes/IRM_4_23_20_7_2.pdf
10. What Is IRS Form 945? - Gusto, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://gusto.com/resources/articles/taxes/irs-form-945
11. 2025 Instructions for Form 945 - IRS, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i945.pdf
12. FORM 1099 OID (1989) - IRS, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-prior/f1099oid--1989.pdf
13. Form 945: Annual Return of Withheld Federal Income Tax - Thomson Reuters, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://www.thomsonreuters.com/en-us/help/accounting-cs/prepare-form-940-941-943-944-945/form-945-ann-return-of-with-fed-income-tax
14. 5.19.3 Backup Withholding Program | Internal Revenue Service, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://www.irs.gov/irm/part5/irm_05-019-003r

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

15. IRS Form 56 Explained: Who Needs to File It? - Expat Tax Online, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://www.expattaxonline.com/irs-form-56/
16. NEIDLE SAYS IAIN CLIFFORD'S $4.4 MILLION SIGNATURE CREDIT RECOUPMENT CONFIRMED BY AN IRS WAGES AND TAX TRANSCRIPT IS A FANTASY – IS IT? - Ecclesia Law Institute, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://ecclesia-law-institute.ghost.io/neidle-says-iain-cliffords-4-4-million-signature-credit-recoupment-confirmed-by-an-irs-wages-and-tax-transcript-is-a-fantasy-is-it/
17. Bills of Exchange Act, 1882, Section 20, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://www.legislation.ie/eli/1882/act/61/section/20/enacted/en/html
18. Section 20 - Bills of Exchange Act 1882 - Legislation.gov.uk, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/45-46/61/section/20
19. forensic analysis of the clifford protocol neidle's questions answered neidle's mallicious assertions debunked, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://taxpolicy.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/2026-03-11-forensic_analysis_clifford_protocol.pdf
20. Rev Proc 2002-26 - Bradford Tax Institute, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://bradfordtaxinstitute.com/Endnotes/Rev_Proc_2002-26.pdf
21. Weder v. United States ex rel. Internal Revenue Serv. | W.D. Okla. | Judgment - CaseMine, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://www.casemine.com/judgement/us/59edf852add7b02b6f79a17a
22. Memorandum - IRS, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-wd/0720015.pdf
23. irm procedural update - IRS, accessed on July 24, 2026, http://www.irs.gov/pub/foia/ig/spder/IPU_CPR_WI-03-0513-0978.pdf
24. FinCEN Ruling 2003-8 – Definition of Money Transmitter (Merchant Payment, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://www.fincen.gov/system/files/administrative_ruling/fincenruling2003-8.pdf
25. Application of Money Services Business Regulations to Daily Money Management Services, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://www.fincen.gov/resources/statutes-regulations/administrative-rulings/application-money-services-business-2
26. California to Clarify Money Transmission Act Exemption Through Rulemaking - Mayer Brown, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://www.mayerbrown.com/-/media/files/perspectives-events/publications/2019/03/californiaclarifymoneytransmissionactexemptionthroughrulemaking.pdf
27. SECTION 3-302 Holder in Due Course - NYS Open Legislation | NYSenate.gov, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/UCC/3-302
28. Tag: Fraud - Tax Policy Associates, accessed on July 24, 2026, https://taxpolicy.org.uk/tag/fraud/

ECCLESIA
LAW

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice